# *Appendix 4D*
# *Administrative Services, Information Services, and Driver Services Sample Measures*

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Service level % |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Service Attribute<br>Process effectiveness (quality) | Alan Haight, Customer Service Center (CSC) Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percentage of calls answered within 5 minutes or less (for Drivers Services) and 2 minutes or less (for vehicle services).<br>The percentage of calls answered within these timeframes is considered to be a direct reflection of customers' expectation to be served in a fast, efficient manner. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| The Call Management System computes the time required to answer each call throughout the day in half hour increments. The number of calls that are answered within required timeframes is divided by the number of calls received to create a percentage. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Vehicle Services Management<br>Driver Services Management<br>Customer Call Center Administrator and supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 5 minutes or less for Driver Services<br>2 minutes or less for Vehicle Services<br>Benchmarks were developed based on historical performance and what the CSC thought they could deliver. Driver Services has traditionally been short-staffed and the manager believed that it would take some time before the industry standard/target is met. | The future target will be 2 minutes for all service areas. The industry standard is associated with the industry standard abandon rate of 5%. In order to achieve an abandon rate of 5%, calls need to be picked up within 2 minutes. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Service Level % (continued)***

***Notes:***

- Managers believe that these data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. Data are system generated and reported on standard reports.
- Calculations are well documented in the Service Level Agreements.
- The Customer Service Center Administrator and supervisors observe real-time call waiting statistics to monitor how long calls are in the queue to redistribute workload to meet performance targets. In the longer term, service level % is used to manage staffing levels and determine training needs.
- Driver and Vehicle Services management uses the Service Level Agreement (SLA) Performance report measurement to monitor compliance with SLA standards.
- Call center industry data are widely available, and are periodically used to compare with DOL results and to modify targets.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Busy signal % |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Service Attribute<br>Process effectiveness (quality) | Alan Haight<br>Customer Service Center Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent of all calls during the month that receive a busy signal.<br>Busy signals reflect an unacceptable level of customer service. All calls presented to the Automated Call Distribution queue should be allowed into the queue without receiving a busy signal. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Divide the daily number of busy signals by the total calls received from the Call Management System. Data is collected daily then a monthly simple average is calculated. In the future, the CSC Administrator hopes to use a weighted average for monthly statistics. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Driver Services Management<br>Vehicle Services Management<br>Customer Call Center Administrator and supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Baseline is 0% (this is the industry standard) | Target is always 0% |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe that these data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. Data are system generated and reported on standard reports.
- Measure is well documented in Service Level Agreements.
- Call center industry data are widely available, and are periodically used to compare with DOL results and to modify targets.

***Busy signal % (continued):***

- The Customer Service Center Administrator monitors busy signals to determine if the call center is able to meet customer demand. Two years ago the department experienced a very high rate of busy signals. Since then, the agency has instituted a performance management system, implemented an Interactive Voice Response System, and consolidated separate division call centers into one to improve busy signal performance.
- Driver and Vehicles Services management uses the Service Level Agreement (SLA) Performance report measurement to monitor compliance with SLA standards.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** E-mail turnaround |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Service Attribute<br>Process effectiveness (quality) | Alan Haight<br>Customer Service Center Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent customer of e-mails received by the Customer Services Center that are answered within 5 working days.<br>As email activity continues to expand as a channel of communication with our customers it is critical that the agency manages its response time to avoid follow-up calls to the CSC and ensure a high level of service quality. It is also important that it monitors the activity in this channel to ensure that technology to automate responses is deployed when it makes economic sense. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| The measure is calculated by dividing the total e-mails in a month that were responded to within 5 working days by the total number of all e-mails requiring responses. Data source is MS Outlook. The response rate is calculated monthly. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Vehicle Services Management<br>Customer Call Center Administrator and supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Governor's standard is 14 days<br>DOL agency standard is 5 working days | 100% in 3 working days |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## E-Mail turnaround (continued)

## Notes:

- Managers believe that these data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. Data are system generated and reported on standard reports.
- Measure is well documented in Service Level Agreements.
- This measure is used to make planning and operational improvements. The CSC Administrator monitors performance to identify training or workload issues. Vehicle Service management uses the Service Level Agreement (SLA) Performance report measurement to monitor compliance with SLA standards.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Calls per FTE per day |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Efficiency | Alan Haight<br>Customer Service Center Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The total number of calls handled, on average, by each Full Time Equivalent (FTE) position<br>Call productivity per person is the primary productivity measure for the CSC, which ensure we are utilizing staff fully and minimizing our cost per call. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| The Call Management System calculates the total login hours individually and for the group as a whole. Dividing the login hours by 9 (the number of hours each staff person is logged in per day which includes breaks and lunch) provides the average FTE per day. Divide the number of calls answered by the average FTE total. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Driver Services Management<br>Vehicle Services Management<br>Customer Call Center Administrator<br>Administrative Service Assistant Director |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 90 calls per day.<br>Based on a historical average of 4 minutes per call with 1 minute data entry or follow-up time per call. This is applied to 7.5 hours per day – which is total hours at work less break and lunch time. | None identified. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## *Calls per FTE per day (continued)*

## *Notes:*

- Managers believe that these data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. Data are system generated and reported on standard reports.
- The measure is used by the call center to make operational improvements.
- Vehicle Service management uses the Service Level Agreement (SLA) Performance report measurement to monitor compliance with SLA standards.
- Call center industry data are widely available, and are periodically used to compare with DOL results and to modify targets.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** % of DOL locations collecting and depositing revenue according to RCW 43.01.050 per quarter. |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Accuracy and quality | Cindy Cavanagh, Revenue Accounting Manager |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent of all DOL locations that collect and deposit revenues according to requirements of the RCW.<br>The purpose of this measure is to ensure field office compliance with the Treasurer's Office's required standards for payment processing. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Treasurer's daily reports indicate if Title and Registration Offices accounts have expected dollars available for deposit and balance reports tell whether or not the deposits balance to transactions for the day.<br>Mail in processes have manual counts of how many deposits are held over each day. The potential errors and mail in holdover counts are divided by the total number of offices collected payments.<br>Calculation methods are documented by Revenue Accounting Manager. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Quarterly | Revenue Accounting Manager<br>Administrative Services Assistant Director<br>Reported to ELT as requested |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 100% (required by State Treasurer's Office) | None identified. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | ? | Yes | Yes |

## % of DOL locations collecting and depositing revenue according to RCW 43.01.050 per quarter (continued)

### Notes:

- Most data are verifiable. Only mail-in payments held over cannot be readily validated.
- Data are largely from system generated reports. Manual counts for mail-in payments are based on trust.
- Substandard performance on this measure is used as an indicator for additional training needs.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** % of accurate and timely collection of revenue throughout DOL per quarter |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Accuracy and quality | Cindy Cavanagh<br>Revenue Accounting Manager |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent of revenue transactions for which errors were found during the quarter.<br>The purpose of this measure is to determine accuracy and timeliness of revenue processing conducted by all cash receipt avenues at DOL (including internet payments). |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Division error reports + number of requests to move dollars booked to incorrect funds + error transmission records + internet error reports divided by the total number of transactions.<br>Summarized by the Revenue Accounting Manager. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Quarterly | Revenue Accounting Manager<br>Administrative Services Assistant Director<br>Reported to ELT as requested |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 98% is the average historical benchmark. | 100% ( a goal that is impossible to achieve) |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe data are reliable. Data can be audited to the source.
- Managers use this measure to identify and fix accuracy issues.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** % reduction of drivers license undeliverable mail per quarter |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Efficiency and Effectiveness | Kitty Boring<br>Manager Mail Center |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent of mail that is returned as undeliverable in a quarter.<br>% of returned mail is a measure of how effectively DOL delivers licensing services and is also and efficiency measure since returned mail results in added costs to the licensing process. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| The number of returned mail items is counted by the automated mail opening machine that provides daily totals of returned mail received. The returned mail totals for the month are divided by the number of pieces mailed provided by the Digimatch mail services provider. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Quarterly | Administrative Services, Vehicles and Drivers Assistant Administrators. They use this measure to determine if strategies implemented to improve address accuracy have been effective. |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Reduce returned mail by 2% when the Coding Accuracy Support System (CASS) is implemented by the first division. | Targets will continue to be revised as CASS is implemented in phases to each division. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- This measure is used to test the performance of new strategies for improving address accuracy and reducing the cost of remailing licenses.
- This measure's definition and calculation appear to be well-understood, but are not formally documented.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** # of on line transactions by type |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Workload/Output | Bill Kehoe<br>Chief Information Officer |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The total number of transactions that were processed on-line during the time period.<br>This measure is intended to show progress towards of goal of conducting 1.7 million transactions on-line. The measure is intended to examine the effectiveness of e-business strategies implemented to improve customer service and reduce costs. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Sum of transactions from web application systems. (Includes non-transportation transactions, although transactions are available by application.)<br>"Transaction" is defined as an activity where a credit card payment is made or a database is updated because a service has been delivered. Transactions do not include inquiries or web hits. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly and Quarterly | Governor, DOL Executive Team |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 8.5 million transactions logged in 2001-2002 biennium. | 1.7 million for the 2003-2004 biennium. The goal was developed based on a 100% increase from the prior biennium. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ? |

## # of on-line transactions by type (continued)

### Notes:

- Managers believe data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure.
- Plans are to continue to add services on the web and increase marketing efforts to increase the percentage of services provided over the web.
- Even though this is a workload or output measure, the DOL uses it as a measure of the effectiveness of e-business strategies that have been implemented to improve customer service and reduce costs.
- The number of on-line transactions will naturally increase as new services are added. Consequently, the measure is not useful to understand the adoption of existing services.
- The DOL has incomplete control over this measure. It can make web-based services available and can motivate customers through advertising or other means to use them, but cannot ensure that customers will embrace the services.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Availability of Business Division Computer Software Applications |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Service quality | Bill Kehoe<br>Chief Information Officer (CIO) |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

Percent of time Business Software Applications are available for use as agreed to in the Division Application Support Matrix (application and hours of support).

Availability of applications to DOL staff and on-line access via the Internet is considered essential to meeting customer service standards.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

The total number of system outages (in minutes) is divided by the total number of minutes the system was available during agreed application support hours. Data source: DOL System Outage Report (maintained manually) and system generated reports. Data is collected daily – logging any system outages on the System Outage Report and weekly from the various system generated reports.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Quarterly | Division Assistant Directors, CIO, IS Managers |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| None identified. | 99.5% availability during application support hours. Based on industry standards and historical data. This is considered a goal that is a stretch requiring some improvement over prior history yet is attainable. The goal will eventually be set at 99.9%. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## *Availability of Business Division Computer Software Applications (continued)*

### *Notes:*

- Managers believe data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure.
- The measure is used to make planning and operational improvements, consistent with the Information System Division's desire for continuous improvement.
- Industry data relating to system availability is available, and can be used for comparison with DOL results and to modify targets.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** % of customers that rate the quality of Desktop Support Service as above average. |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Customer satisfaction, perceived service quality | Bill Kehoe<br>Chief Information Officer (CIO) |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| Percentage of customers surveyed that rank the quality of service as a #4 or #5 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 3 being average, 4 being above average, and 5 being excellent.<br>The purpose of this measure is to determine if desktop support services are matched to actual technology needs of staff supporting customer service processes. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Conduct a random survey of desktop support customers. Use a ranking of 1-5 with 1 being poor, 2 being below average, 3 being average, 4 being above average, and 5 being excellent. Count results to determine if 80% or more answer 4 or 5. Track, record and report number of non-responses compared as a percent of total number of survey responses completed to ensure that a statistically valid representation is used to calculate the performance measure. Date Source: HR developed survey of Desktop clients who used Desktop Support services in the most recently completed quarter. Customers are e-mailed a notice to participate in the survey by entering their opinions on the Intranet survey instrument. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Quarterly | Assistant Directors, CIO, IS Managers |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| No baseline established. | 80% - a goal that is considered a stretch based on past performance – yet attainable. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***% of customers that rate the quality of Desktop Support Service as above average (continued)***

***Notes:***

- Measure is well documented and data is collected systematically.
- This survey identifies service quality issues. Typically the IS Managers will conduct additional research by attending customer staff meetings to determine the root cause of low ratings in service quality.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Licensing Service Office (LSO) average wait time |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Customer service attribute, timeliness | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

The average time in minutes that it takes for a customer to reach a Customer Services Specialist after they arrive at the Licensing Services Office (LSO).

The average wait time is the average of customer wait times captured by the Q-Matic/Q-Win system at 35 LSOs statewide for the month. The measure is used to measure how well LSOs manage workload to provide timely customer service. Wait times are relevant to front line staff and all levels of management.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

The Q-Matic/Q-Win system provides a monthly average that is data entered into the Driver Examining Workload Model. Data source: Q-Matic/Q-Win.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly, quarterly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers, LSO supervisors, LSO employees |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Baseline is 20 minutes. Based on a review of customer comment cards and random sample customer survey. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## *Licensing Service Office (LSO) average wait time (continued)*

### *Notes:*

- Managers believe data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure.
- Generally, LSOs are meeting expectations for customer wait times and no formal target has been set for further reductions in the wait time standard. However, LSOs that fall short of wait time standards are required to address the situation with a remediation plan.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Drive test wait days |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Timeliness, customer service attribute | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The average number of business days that a customer must wait for a drive test appointment.<br><br>Drive test wait days is a measure of timeliness of customer service provided to customer who wish to take driving tests. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| LSO managers manually calculate the average number of days customers must wait for a drive test. Monthly the information is e-mailed to the regional office and summarized. Regional summaries are then emailed to headquarters where the Workload Model is updated. Data source: LSO manager calculations. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers, LSO supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 10 days or less is the unpublished standard or goal. | None established |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe that data are accurate. Manual calculations are checked for reasonableness.
- If the trend in wait times is not satisfactory, corrective actions are taken.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Utilization based on FTEs currently assigned |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Efficiency | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

The percent of total budgeted resource time that was spent on productive (direct service or product-related) work during the month.

The measure serves as an indicator of whether the LSO's budget includes appropriate staffing for the workload being processed.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

This measure is determined by dividing the minutes of direct service or product-related work accomplished (productive minutes) by the minutes of budgeted time available in the LSO. The result is expressed as a utilization percentage.

"Productive minutes" is calculated by taking the number of transactions completed during the month multiplied by the time required to complete each transaction (from the Workload Model developed by and independent consultant, Dr. McKay).

"Budgeted time available" is the number of budgeted Licensing Services Representative FTE positions in the LSO, plus some portion of supervisory FTE. This amount of supervisory time may be 1-2% or more, depending on the size of the office. These budgeted FTE positions are converted to minutes.

Sources: DFS, Drivers Workload Model, number of LSRs in current budget.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers, LSO supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Interviews revealed there is no commonly understood benchmark standard. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ? | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

## *Utilization based on FTEs currently assigned (continued)*

### *Notes:*

- The calculations and assumptions of this measure are not documented in detail. Dr. McKay is currently under contract to improve the model's documentation.
- Managers believe data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. They do acknowledge that some of the transaction times need to be updated. Dr. McKay is reviewing the data and will make recommendations for improving its accuracy and simplifying the workload model.
- This measure is used as a reference point for utilization calculated based on actual personnel hours available. The comparison can help identify processing performance issues.
- The model uses budgeted staff versus filled positions. By design, it does not factor in non-productive time (vacation, sick leave, breaks, administrative or training time). A more valid measure of true utilization can be found in a related measure ("Utilization based on timesheet with or without diversity").
- This indicator is used in conjunction with wait times to improve operating performance.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Utilization based on Timesheet (with diversity) |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Efficiency | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

A comparison of an LSO's actual work performed during a month (in hours) to the actual staff resource available during that same month (in hours).

This utilization rate is an estimate how much actual work time is spent serving customers. The factor is customized for the demographic make-up of each LSO's customers estimated diversity. The purpose is to determine if workload is being managed such that the majority of an LSR's time is spent serving customers.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

This measure is determined by dividing the minutes of direct service or product-related work accomplished (productive minutes) by the minutes of actual productive time available in the LSO. The result is expressed as a utilization percentage.

"Processing hours" is calculated by taking the number of transactions completed during the month multiplied by the time required to complete each transaction (from the Workload Model developed by independent consultant, Dr. McKay).

"Available productive time" is the number of actual Licensing Services Representative and supervisory minutes available during the month, as captured on employee timesheets.

This estimate is adjusted to reflect the demographics of the LSO's customer base using a statistically calculated diversity factor. The Diversity factor is based on the percentage of written exams that are passed and the percent of customers requesting an identification card. Statistical studies have revealed a correlation between higher test failure rates and customers requesting identification cards with customers that have language issues. A workload study revealed that it takes longer to provide service to customers with language issues. Sources: DFS, Drivers Workload Model, Budgeted LSRs.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers, LSO supervisors |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Utilization is expected to be around 80% for offices that are using their personnel effectively. | None established. |

***Utilization based on timesheet (with diversity) (continued)***

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| Valid? | Well-Specified/Defined? | Verifiable? | Reliable? | Controllable? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Upper level management believes in the accuracy and validity of the measure. At the LSO supervisor level there appears to be some confusion over what the statistical calculations mean.
- The calculations and assumptions of this measure are not documented in detail. Dr. McKay is currently under contract to improve the model's documentation.
- The measure is used to identify workload management issues.
- Because this measure is timesheet-driven, it provides a more realistic picture of the true productive resources of the CSO. "Available hours" excludes non-productive time (sick time, vacation, training, for example) and accounts for temporary resources.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

- 

| **Performance Measure:** Drive Test Pass Rate |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Indicator of diversity levels and consistency of service delivery. | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The percent of driver licensing administered exams that are passed.<br>The percent of drivers that pass the written exam has been identified as an indicator of the level of diversity represented by the customers of a given LSO. Higher failure rates have been correlated to LSOs that service a greater number of customers with language issues. A drive test pass rate that changes dramatically can also indicate some change in an LSO's business processes that should be researched. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Total number of passed drivers exams divided by total number of drivers exams administered. Data source: Drivers Field System (DFS). |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| No baseline. Reviewed for trends and dramatic changes. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. DFS is considered to be a reliable system for data.
- The test pass rate is used to add context to other measure provided in the Drivers workload model. Together, these measures can identify changes in business processes that may be positive or negative.
- The calculation of this measure appears to be well understood, but is not formally documented.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Wait time score |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Customer service attribute, timeliness | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| The wait time score is a letter grade assigned to the wait time performance of an LSO. The purpose of the measure is to better reflect customer service performance than a simple wait time average. The grade weights performance in five minute increments to take into account the standard deviation of wait time performance. For instance, a LSO where all wait times are clustered around 20 minutes with an average of a 20 minute wait time will receive a higher grade than an LSO where some very long wait times are balanced with some short wait times to create a 20 minutes average wait time. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Points are assigned to customer wait times for the month in 10 minute increments. Total points are divided by total customers. This product is then assigned a grade according to a grading scale. Data source: Q-matic/Q-win wait times and the Drivers Workload Model. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | DOL Director, ADs, Driver Service Regional Managers, LSO supervisors, LSO staff |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| C or above is considered an acceptable grade. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ? | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Senior managers have confidence in the data. Interviews suggest that LSO supervisors and staff may not really understand how the grades are calculated.
- This measure's assumptions and calculations are not documented in detail. A consultant is currently under contract to improve the model's documentation.
- Wait time grade is viewed as a major performance indicator for the LSOs. There is a real risk that the grading methodology may cause unintended consequences such as incomplete transaction processing and higher error rates in order arbitrarily force down customer waits.

***Wait time score (continued):***

- The lowest wait times (0-10 minutes) are rewarded with the highest points. Yet, there is no indication that there is a customer or agency benefit to reducing average wait times to less than 20 minutes.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

**Performance Measure:** Cost per product/service

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Efficiency (cost per unit) | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

The total cost of providing a product/service in the following areas:

- Driver Examining Activities
- Driver Responsibility
- Hearing and Interviews

The fee study assigns direct costs and allocates overhead costs to all the various services and products delivered for a fee. The biennial fee study is required by the legislature and used to analyze the fees that are charged relative to actual cost per fee and comparisons to fees from other states. Based on this analysis they may choose to adjust the fees that are legislated.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

Cost per product or service includes the following components:

"Direct costs" are those which can be directly attributed to a sub-program (salaries, benefits, lease costs, supplies, for example). Each sub-program's actual expenditures for the previous biennium are obtained from the Agency Financial Reporting System (AFRS) and then distributed to specific products/services. Driver Examining costs are allocated based on the workload study results. Driver Responsibility and Hearings & Interviews allocate costs based on managerial estimates (see below).

"Indirect costs" or administrative overhead must be allocated to the sub-programs and specific products or services. These costs include a portion of the previous biennium's costs (from AFRS) for the Director's Office, Division Administrator, Information Services Division, and Administrative Services. The portion of these costs 'belonging" to Driver Services is then allocated to sub-programs and products/services based on the following methods:

1) Transaction times. Transaction times from the Workload Study are multiplied by the number of products/services completed to get a total work processing time. The percent of time spent on each product/service is multiplied by the total indirect cost pool to get an indirect cost for each specific product/service. (Driver Examining)

2) Managerial estimates. Structured estimates of the percent of time a cost center spends on each product or service are multiplied by the total indirect cost pool to be allocated. The result is an indirect cost for each specific product/service. (Driver Responsibility and Hearings & Interviews)

Data sources: AFRS, Drivers Workload model, Program manager time estimates.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Biennial | Legislature |

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

***Cost per product/service (continued)***

| Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers? | Target(s) Established? |
|---|---|
| No baseline established. Fees, not costs, are compared with peers. (Fees include costs plus a reserve.) | None established. |

| Valid? | Well-Specified/Defined? | Verifiable? | Reliable? | Controllable? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- The legislature has never questioned the accuracy of the Fee Study.
- The Fee Study is viewed as a source of information for the legislature, and is not used for operating purposes. Management does not necessary use the information to analyze and manage the cost of services provided.
- The DOL is working to improve its administrative cost allocation methodology. The agency's Controller has been charged with assisting management to develop an effective methodology that fully costs products and services.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Workload by type of product/service |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Workload | Don Arlow<br>Driver Services Budget and Planning Manager |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

Workloads or counts of products and services delivered by the Driver Services Division are included in the Fee Study to calculate total Revenue from Fees to compare to total costs of products and services provided.

- Driver Examining Activities
- Driver Responsibility
- Hearing and Interviews

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

Data sources:

- Driver Examining: Drivers Field System (DFS)
- Driver Responsibility: Sworn Report Program and hand counts that are entered into monthly Workload Reports.
- Driver Hearing and Interviews: Hearing and Interviews Statistical Report/Excel system.

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Biennial | Legislature |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| None established. | None established |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | ? | Yes | No |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe that data are accurate, and have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the data.
- These measures is not formally documented or defined in detail.
- Hand counts would be very difficult to verify.
- These measures are not used to make planning and operational improvements. Workload is not a performance measure and this report is primarily developed for external audiences.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

**Performance Measure:** Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Dismissal Rates

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Quality/effectiveness | Craig Nelson<br>Hearings and Interviews Administrator |

**Description/Purpose of Measure:**

The rate at which DUI hearings are dismissed.

Determines the quality and completeness of hearing preparation in order to keep unsafe drivers off the road.

**How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?**

The number of DUI cases dismissed (all reasons) divided by total DUI hearings held. Data Source: Data source: Hearing Officer (HO) data entry in Excel workbook system developed by Craig Nelson. Mr. Nelson copies individual totals to compilation page that produces monthly statistics. (Data are also available by dismissal reason.)

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly and quarterly in some reports | Director, Driver Service Assistant Director, Hearings and Interviews Administrator, Managers and Hearing Officers, Law Enforcement personnel at Washington State Patrol. |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 20% - determined by estimating the improvement that would result from improved processing and scanning of police reports. | The Director has set a challenge goal of 15% |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | ? | Yes | ? |

***Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Dismissal Rates***

**Notes:**

- Managers believe data are accurate, and they have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. It is part of the culture to accurately account for activity in the statistics workbook.
- Only the Administrator has detailed knowledge of how the system works. His administrative assistant could re-create the analysis it if need be.
- Hand counts would be difficult to verify.
- In November 2002 DUI dismissal rates of 37% sparked a new joint initiative between DOL and the Washington State Patrol (WSP) to reduce dismissal rates. Dismissal data by type revealed that incomplete or missing police reports were a major factor causing dismissals. WSP and DOL improved policy report processes and scanned the reports to help ensure reports were available for hearings. This initiative resulted in dropping the DUI dismissal rate to 20% within one year.
- This measure includes dismissals that are due to factors outside of the control of the program. For that reason, this measure should not be used to evaluate program quality or effectiveness. (Data are available to construct this measure to include dismissal reasons that are within the program's control.)

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Average events conducted per Hearing Office (HO) 5 day work week. |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Workload measure | Craig Nelson<br>Hearings and Interviews Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| Compares the workload of HO teams. If the number gets too high, the Administrator must determine how to deal with the additional workload. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Sum of individual hearing officer counts of hearings and interviews data entered into the Excel spreadsheet system / # HOs available/ # work days per month.<br># of HOs available = # days worked x 8 hours per day x HOs per region – hours of leave taken by HOs.<br>Data source: manual entry of events and hours by HO totaled for the month by region. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Director, Driver Service Assistant Director, Hearings and Interviews Administrator, Managers and Hearing Officers |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| Goal is 65-70 per month or 16.6 hearings per week based on historical trends. | |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Yes | ? | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe data are accurate, and they have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure. It is part of the culture to accurately account for activity in the statistics workbook. Hand counts would be difficult to verify, however.
- Only the Administrator has detailed knowledge of how the system works. His administrative assistant could probably recreate the analysis if need be.
- The measure is used to signal the Administrator if additional HO resources are necessary to effectively manage the workload.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measure:** Driving Under the Influence Administrative Action (DUI Admin-per se) turnaround time |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Customer Attribute - Timeliness | Peter Teets<br>Driver Responsibility Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| Turnaround time for documents entering the section.<br>Rapid turnaround is a goal to provide the customer with adequate time to receive the administrative notice and schedule a hearing within 30 days of the original incident. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| This measure is calculated by counting the number of days between the date that the administrative action paperwork is received by the section and the date when the administrative notice is mailed to the customer.<br>Weekly counts are e-mailed to administrative support where the month end report is compiled. Data source: Sworn Report Program. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Driver Service Assistant Director, Driver Responsibility Administrator |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| 3 days – set to meet customer need. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe data are accurate, and they have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure.
- This measure is used to identify processing issues that need to be addressed.
- These data are captured manually.
- The assumptions and calculations for this measure appear to be well-understood, but they are not formally documented.

**Washington TPAB Performance Measures Review**
**Department of Licensing Transportation-Related Programs**
**Measure Evaluation**

| **Performance Measures:** Failure to Appear (FTA) Adjudications turnaround time Certified Copy of Driving Records (CCDRs) turnaround time, Evidence of Financial Responsibility (SR 22's) turnaround time |
|---|

| **Measure Type:** | **Organization/Contact Person:** |
|---|---|
| Timeliness | Peter Teets<br>Driver Responsibility Administrator |

| **Description/Purpose of Measure:** |
|---|
| Turnaround time for various documents entering the section. |

| **How is Measure Calculated? What are the Primary Data Sources?** |
|---|
| Manual count of days from receipt of document to completion of work. |

| **Reporting Frequency:** | **Target Audience:** |
|---|---|
| Monthly | Driver Service Assistant Director, Driver Responsibility Administrator |

| **Benchmark/Baseline Established? How created? Compared to Peers?** | **Target(s) Established?** |
|---|---|
| • FTA - 2 days – set to lower the risk of Tort Claims for an unnecessary suspension..<br>• CCDR – 1 day – Set to meet customers (District and Municipal Courts) needs<br>• SR -22 – 1 day – Set to lower the risk of Tort Claims for unnecessary suspensions. | None established. |

| **Valid?** | **Well-Specified/Defined?** | **Verifiable?** | **Reliable?** | **Controllable?** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ? | ? | Yes | Yes |

***Notes:***

- Managers believe data are accurate, and they have confidence in the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the measure.
- This measure is used to identify processing issues that need to be addressed.
- Hand counts are not easily verified.
- The assumptions and calculations for this measure appear to be well-understood, but they are not formally documented.